

## **Model Municipal Stormwater Program for Eastern Washington – Sept. 2002 Draft Summary of Public Comments Received**

Comments are grouped by topic/chapter (in italics). Commenter is identified in bold. The comments below are in most cases summaries of the actual comment received.

### *Model Program Organizational Comments*

**Chelan/Douglas County:** The Model Program will have greater value to users if the program elements are rearranged and/or combined in a more logical fashion, perhaps as outlined below. This may help communities to more effectively deal with each program element and better understand the relationship between elements. The Model Program should also be restructured to encourage communities to approach this as a planning exercise, that is, to develop a plan and secondly, a program for implementation. Additionally, each element should be developed with meaningful public/stakeholder involvement to assure community support for the program. Finally, the proposed timing for implementation of each element should incorporate greater flexibility in order that communities can successfully move from one task to the next.

Chelan/Douglas County suggested the following Program Modifications & Timing:

#### Public Involvement & Participation

- develop a public involvement plan, consistent with the adopted GMA public involvement plan—complete within 6 months
- implement the plan—over the course of the 5 year permit

#### Public Education

- develop a public education element, with citizen involvement—complete by the end of year 1
- implement the strategy—over the course of the 5 year permit

#### Illicit Discharge Detection & Elimination

- assess existing conditions
- identify needs
- examine alternatives
- develop an overall plan—complete by the end of year 2
- prepare a program for implementation & proceed—years 3 thru 5
- develop & implement a record keeping system

#### Construction Stormwater Control & Post-Construction Stormwater Management

- assess existing conditions
- identify needs
- examine alternatives
- develop an overall plan—complete by the end of year 3
- prepare a program for implementation & proceed—years 4 thru 5

- develop & implement a record keeping system

Pollution Prevention /Good Housekeeping

- assess existing conditions
- identify needs
- examine alternatives
- develop an O&M plan—complete by the end of year 3
- train staff on procedures—complete by the middle of year 4
- implement BMP's—thru the end of the permit
- develop & implement a record keeping system

*Chapter 1 – Introduction*

**Chelan/Douglas County:** How should the impacts of agricultural land that contribute sediments/pollutants to the MS4 be handled?

**Chelan/Douglas County:** Who verifies compliance on industrial sites that are required to have an NPDES Industrial stormwater permit?

**Ecology:** Regulatory language in Chapter 1 of Model Program and Manual should be consistent and/or identical. Ecology will provide language to use. Mention Phase II application form.

**Yakima County:** Introduction in model program and manual should include information that summarizes how the law is intended to affect development and land uses. In addition, Phase I and II affect development and land uses differently. The documents might include a summary table that describes:

- Development types (new construction, redevelopment, etc.)
- Uses (industrial, commercial, etc.)
- Areas to address (construction stormwater control, treatment, flow control, etc.)

*Model Program Boundary*

**Chelan/Douglas County:** Clarification is needed on how appropriate Phase II boundaries should be established (Chapter 1).

**Ecology:** Model program should apply throughout the jurisdiction, however, the Phase II general permit (not yet developed) could be limited to requiring programs be implemented within the UA boundary.

**Spokane County:** Program boundary should be the smallest boundary possible. Ecology should not enlarge boundary beyond Federal Rules.

**Spokane County:** Spokane County should not be listed in the “mandatory coverage” category. County does not discharge from an MS4 to waters of the State.

**Yakima County:** The program boundary should also include areas of significant industrial or commercial land uses that are outside of the urbanized area and discharge to surface waters.

### *Chapter 2 & 3 – Public Education and Involvement*

**Yakima County:** Public education needs to be tailored to each community. Recommend that Ecology re-institute “water quality education support” program.

### *Chapter 4 – Illicit discharges*

**Chelan/Douglas County:** How much effort is anticipated in the screening of outfalls? (Chapter 4)

**Ecology:** List of “allowable” non-stormwater discharges on page 4-3 includes some inappropriate sources. Do not label these sources as “allowable” – use language in the federal rules.

**City of Spokane:** In section 4.3.4 (p.4-11) revise the boxed BMP statement for clarification to read "Required BMP 4D: Visually inspect for illicit discharges during dry weather at all known outfalls that discharge to surface waters."

**Yakima County:** Program must include effective enforcement measures.

### *Chapter 5 – Construction*

**Chelan/Douglas County:** Who verifies compliance or performs plan reviews on construction sites inside and/or outside of the urban area that are required to have an NPDES Construction stormwater permit?

**Chelan/Douglas County:** Will there be requirements for personnel performing plan reviews and inspections? Education? Certification? (Chapter 5)

**Ecology:** Chapter 5 of Model Program (Construction) should be consistent with Core Element #2 in Chapter 2 of the Manual. Both subcommittees should review together.

**Yakima County:** Model program treats all projects the same. For simple projects that are not exempt, some method should be developed for streamlining or simplifying the process.

### *Chapter 6 – Post-Construction*

**Ecology:** Chapter 6 of Model Program (New Development) should be consistent with Core Elements #5 and #6 in Chapter 2 of Manual and design specification in Chapters 5 and 6 of Manual. Both subcommittees should review together. BMP 6E (Inspections of structural post-construction BMPs) should propose an inspection schedule (not covered in Manual).

**Yakima County:** Include the ability to use post development control methods that are equivalent to typical stormwater treatment. For example, using a water quality based program of street sweeping for post construction instead of treatment.

### *Chapter 7 – Good Housekeeping*

**Ecology:** Chapter 7 of Model Program (Good Housekeeping) should be consistent with Core Element #7 (Source Control) in Chapter 2 of the Manual and design specifications in Chapter 8 of the Manual. Both subcommittees should review together.

### *Chapter 8 – Reporting*

**Ecology:** Reporting and record keeping (Chapter 8) needs to address assessment of the effectiveness of BMPs. Not necessarily chemical or biological monitoring, but could include qualitative information. Ecology recommends the Subcommittee consider: visual monitoring of during dry and wet weather conditions, including photos upstream and downstream of each outfall; jurisdictions cooperatively monitoring BMP effectiveness; conducting surveys to assess the effectiveness of public outreach and education efforts; and reporting (in addition to the number of inspections completed) whether BMPs are properly constructed and operated.

### *Chapter 9 – Costs*

No specific comments received.

### *Editorial Comments*

BMP 4D in the text (page 4-11) relates to Conducting Field Inspections, and the Cost Estimates relates to the Spill Response Plan.

Also, in the estimate, BMP 4F Screen Outfalls - there is no "Additional Years" cost, but this would be an activity that would have a perpetual annual cost.